

Remarks

Claims 1–34 are pending in the application. Claims 1–34 are rejected. Amendments to the application are shown above. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1–18, 21–25 and 30–32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall (U.S. 5,974,541) in view of MacLeod (U.S. 6,886,171). Claims 19–20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of MacLeod, and further in view of Cafarelli (U.S. 6,697,870). Claims 26–29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of MacLeod, and further in view of Liu (U.S. 6,341,322). Claims 33–34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hall in view of MacLeod, and further in view of Barker (U.S. 6,542,075).

Claim 1 as presently amended expressly recites (emphasis added):

A method in a computer system, comprising:
using a device driver, independently polling a removable media storage device associated with the device driver for one or more events occurring at the removable media storage device, wherein each event has an associated change notification, wherein the removable media storage device is part of a media changer library including one or more removable media storage devices; and
sending, by the device driver, the change notification to a library manager, wherein the library manager manages media at the one or more removable media storage devices of the media changer library.

Reply to Office Action mailed Apr. 5, 2006

Application Number: 09/935,809

Attorney Docket Number: 158508.01

Filing Date: Aug. 23, 2001

Hall is directed to asynchronous event notification in a General Purpose Instrumentation Bus (GPIB) system for performing test and measurement functions (col. 1, lines 13–16). A GPIB application interfaces through device drivers to communicate with GPIB instruments for high level control of the GPIB instruments (col. 4, lines 21–26). The GPIB application may be developed using “GPIB libraries” (col. 4, lines 30–35; cited by Examiner on page 4 of the instant Office Action in connection with former claim 2). However, Hall fails to disclose “wherein the removable media storage device is part of a media changer library including one or more removable media storage devices; and sending, by the device driver, the change notification to a library manager, wherein the library manager manages media at the one or more removable media storage devices of the media changer library” as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

MacLeod is directed to input/output virtual address (IOVA) translation and validation using device drivers. However, MacLeod fails to disclose “wherein the removable media storage device is part of a media changer library including one or more removable media storage devices; and sending, by the device driver, the change notification to a library manager, wherein the library manager manages media at the one or more removable media storage devices of the media changer library” as expressly claimed by the Applicant.

Thus, Hall and MacLeod, whether taken singularly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest at least one of the expressly recited limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the cited references. Independent claims 7 and 14 distinguish from the cited references for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 3–6, 8–13, 15–16, 19–23, 25–26, 28 and 30–32 are dependent claims and distinguish for at least the same reasons as their independent base claims in

Reply to Office Action mailed Apr. 5, 2006
Application Number: 09/935,809
Attorney Docket Number: 158508.01
Filing Date: Aug. 23, 2001

addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the instant § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS 35-42

The Applicant submits that new claim 35 is allowable over the cited references. Dependent claims 36-42 are allowable based on their dependency from allowable independent claim 35.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Reply to Office Action mailed Apr. 5, 2006
Application Number: 09/935,809
Attorney Docket Number: 158508.01
Filing Date: Aug. 23, 2001

PATENT

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed payment, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: August 2, 2006

By: 

Anthony H. Azure, Reg. No.: 52,580
Attorney for Applicant
Direct telephone (425) 707-0399
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

August 2, 2006
Date


Signature

Noemi Tovar
Printed Name

Reply to Office Action mailed Apr. 5, 2006
Application Number: 09/935,809
Attorney Docket Number: 158508.01
Filing Date: Aug. 23, 2001